

THE
MIRACLES
OF
JESUS
VINDICATED.

PART II.

CONTAINING

A Defence of the Literal Story of
JESUS's driving the BUYERS
and SELLERS out of the
TEMPLE,

AND
Suffering the DEVILS to enter in
to the Herd of SWINE.

The SECOND EDITION.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS at the *Oxford-Arms* in
Warwick-Lane. MDCCXXX.

[Price Six-pence.]

MEMORANDUM

TO THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

SUBJECT: [Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]



THE
MIRACLES of JESUS
VINDICATED.

PART II.



Y former Discourse endeavour'd to establish the Truth of that Great Miracle, the Resurrection of *Jesus*, and in pursuance of that Design I shew'd it to be Absolutely Impossible that the Apostles should be Deceived, and Morally Impossible that they should intend to Deceive Mankind: The Proofs of these two Particulars were Then laid before the Reader in so Short and yet so Plain a manner, that (as I am encourag'd to hope by better Judges than my self) they amount to no less than a full Demonstration of the Fact in Question.

In that small Treatise it was not attempted to clear the Apostles from the Charge of *Enthusiasm*, because what was There said, when laid together, seem'd a full Vindication of them in this Particular; but since those who have got a Plausible Word on their side, are fond of making the Most of it, and affect to range the Apostles under a third Class, that of *Enthusiasts*, I shall follow them into this Covert, and try to force them out of it, by shewing how effectually all Suspicion of

Enthusiasm has been removed from them, by what has been already Prov'd on the Article of *Jesus's* Resurrection.

Enthusiasm in its only Proper Sense (when apply'd to Teachers) is the asserting something for Truth upon a Strong but false Imagination of being Divinely Inspir'd; You see then that the Subject, whereon the warm Brain of the *Enthusiast* displays it self, is Opinion and Doctrine only; but the Point in Question between Us was a Fact, *viz.* the Resurrection of *Jesus*, in which (as then appear'd) it is Absolutely Impossible that they should have been Deceived, they having such Proofs of it, as the Scriptures call, and I shew'd to be, *Infallible* ones. It must be observ'd that the Evidence, which They had of *Jesus's* being Alive again, was Sensible Evidence, Frequently repeated, and made Good to more of their Senses than One; and that *the Gift of Tongues*, which was the Divine Power *within* them, was only a Confirmation of the Goodness of this Evidence: They did not reason, as the *Enthusiast* does; This I teach for Truth of Doctrine, because I am Divinely Inspir'd; but, This I teach for Truth of Fact, because I was Eye-witness to it, and felt and handled it; and that my Senses did not Deceive me in that Outward Object I am sure, because I feel within me the Accomplishment of that Promise, which *Jesus* made me After his Resurrection.

Or take *Enthusiasm* in its less Proper Sense, and understand by it no more than a Man's being more strongly persuaded of the Truth of any Thing than he has Reason for: And extend it (if you please) to Facts as well as Opinions; nay (rather than not allow it room enough to range in) suppose it to be an Odd and Extravagant Mixture of being Deceived and Deceiving too; Yet the Apostles are Safe, and their Testimony concerning *Jesus's* Resurrection can never be charged with any the least Suspicion of *Enthusiasm*: For my Discourse (if it Prov'd any thing) Prov'd that the Foundation, on which they built their Strong Per-
suasion,

suasion, was such as could easily support the whole Weight of the Superstructure: It was shew'd, that the Fact which they asserted for True, was not asserted upon the Force of a Suppos'd or a Real Divine Impulse only, but upon Sensible Evidence, of the Strongest kind; such as would have been in all Respects Sufficient, tho' Alone, but yet such as was (beyond any other Fact that ever happen'd) strengthen'd and confirm'd by a Divine Power within them: And (if any thing in Nature is Certain) This must be so, that such as are prov'd not to have been Deceiv'd or Deceivers, cannot come under the Censure of that which is thought a Mixture of both. Two Substances blended together don't constitute a third of a Distinct Sort, however it may have a Distinct Name: And a Man would desire no better Proof that there was no *Punch* in the Glass before him, than to have it prov'd, that none of the several Ingredients which compose that Liquor, were to be found there.

So that, notwithstanding this Charge of *Enthusiasm*, it must be allow'd that the Testimony of the Apostles is True, when they tell us that *Jesus Rose from the Dead on the Third Day*, as he had foretold.

If this Point therefore be gain'd (and 'till I can see something Material offer'd against it, I may presume it to be gain'd), I have laid so strong a Foundation, that no Exceptions to any of the Miracles, which *Jesus* wrought in his Life-time, can be of Weight and Force enough to make a Reasonable and Unprejudic'd Person disbelieve them: For if *Jesus* wrought the Greatest of all Miracles in Raising himself from the Dead, a thing so plainly beyond all the Powers of Nature, a thing so seemingly Impossible, a thing which not only no Human Art could effect, but no Human Wisdom could foresee, can there be any Shadow of a Reason to doubt whether He wrought those Other Miracles, which have such visibly less Difficulties in them, and against which the very best Exceptions must be meer Trifles in comparison of the Former? If
before

before his Death he had plaid the part of a Cheat and an Impostor, is it Conceivable that God would have permitted him to Rise from the Grave; especially when in Proof of his Mission from God, and of his working Real Miracles, he appeal'd in his Life-time to this Great future Event, and plac'd his whole Character upon this Resurrection? Or can we imagine that his Disciples, who had such Strong, Sensible, Inward Evidence for the Reality of his having been Alive again, could have any Temptation to forge Other Miracles, and ascribe Actions to him which he never perform'd? Was it not Probable, was it not at least Possible, that they should be Detected in the Falsehood of Things, many of which they report him to have done in the most Publick manner, and before Numbers not only of his Followers but of his Enemies? And would not the Discovery of any One Miracle falsely ascrib'd to their Master have been an Invincible Prejudice against the True Miracle, which they witness'd to, and built their whole Scheme upon? The Resurrection, Alone, was a Convincing Proof that he came from God; and a Hundred True Miracles could not possibly have Added so much Weight to the Proof of it, as one False one, Detected, would certainly have taken from it. So that what room was there for Forgery, when the Only Method that the Apostles could use to gain Credit to the Resurrection which they were sure of, was never to report any thing of *Jesus* which they Knew to be False, or were not Sure to be True?

Here then is not only a Reasonable Presumption, but a Strong Consequence in favour of all the Miracles which are attributed to *Jesus* in the Gospels: Every Impartial Man must believe the Literal Account of them to be True, and the Miracles to have been Real ones, unless it can be made out clearly that there is an Absolute Impossibility in any of them. This is the only Case, which will allow us to make a Stand: For it is not sufficient to say that This or That particular

particular

ticular Circumstance seems absurd, because the Absurdity may arise from our want of Materials for Information: The Objection may owe its Birth to Ignorance, and he who makes it, may have his Share of this as well as his Neighbour. Consider that almost 1700 Years have pass'd since these Miracles were wrought; the Climate and the Language, the Customs and the Genius of the People were very different from ours; the Story is often told in a short and uncircumstantial Manner, and Allusions are commonly made to the History of those Times, and to the Situation of those Places, which we are not fully acquainted with. On all these Accounts and many others, Things may seem strange and even absurd to us, which were the most obvious and familiar to the Natives of *Judea*.

But if we had no Helps at all to clear up these Matters against Objections, yet we might be said rather to be without them than to want them; for there is no Want, where there is a direct Proof; and the Consequence from *Jesus's* Resurrection being a true Fact, to his other Miracles being truly wrought, is what no one can reasonably deny to be a direct Proof.

However since Objections have been rais'd by some against the literal Story of almost all the principal Miracles of *Jesus*, I am not unwilling to enter into a particular Examination of them, that the Reader may see how the Cavils of these Men are the weakest and most frivolous that can be conceived; such as the meanest Author, that I ever met with before, would not stoop to make Use of; such as in any other Cause, but that of Religion, a wise Man would condemn and walk over: Nor shall the unfair Arts, which they employ to give a Colour to these Cavils be forgotten in their proper Place. I will venture to say, that were these open'd, and expos'd to their Readers, (as they ought to be) such Writers could never be able to bring any Thing into Discredit but their own Writings.

At present I shall confine my self to the Literal Accounts of the two first Miracles, which a late

(a) Author has undertaken to expose; but in what Manner, and with what Success, the Reader will be soon convinc'd.

I. I begin (as he does) with *the Miracle of Jesus's driving the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple.*

All the Objections which he has rais'd against it are reduceable to these three Heads.

That there was no Profanation of the Temple by Buyers and Sellers, as is pretended.

That, if there was, yet *Jesus* could not have executed such a Work as driving them out of the Temple.

That, if he could have executed it, yet it was a needless Work, because the Temple was so soon to be destroyed and polluted.

1. §. In Proof of his first Objection he brings the Testimony of *St. Hilary*, p. 25. that *there was no such Market kept in the Temple*: And for fear this should not hold, he quotes *St. Austin* as saying, that *there could be no great Sin in selling and buying Things in the Temple, that were for the Use of it, and offered as Sacrifice in it.* But the Reader may remember that I have already convicted *Mr. W.* of false Evidence in this Quotation from *St. Hilary*, Part 1. p. 27. and I hope that for the future he will forbear to make an Affidavit-man of him. And yet were this Quotation an honest one, of what Weight could it be? since the Testimony of the four Evangelists, who were Contemporaries, and upon the Spot, must be preferr'd before that of a Writer who lived some Hundreds of Years afterwards, especially in a Fact of so publick a Nature, that, if it was false, the *Jews* in every Part of the World could have detected it upon their own Knowledge, because they went up yearly from every Part of the World to the Temple to celebrate the Passover; and therefore could not but know whether at any Passover, at that particularly, such a Traffick was carried on in the Temple or not.

But

But I will give Mr. *W.* another Testimony of the Fact, such as even his Friend the *Jewish Rabbi* shall be forced to allow for a good one: It is the Testimony of the ancient *Jews* themselves, who (we may be sure) did not relate the Matter falsely, to serve the Cause of the Evangelists. In the Babylonish *Talmud* it is declared, that (a) *forty Years before the Temple was destroy'd, the Great Council remov'd* (from the (b) Place where they us'd to assemble in the Inner-Court of the Temple), *and sat among the Shops.* Count back forty Years from the Destruction of the Temple, and you will find that this Removal was about three or four Years before this Action of our Saviour's, and consequently that there was a Place called the *Shops* about that Time. At the same Time one *Jewish Rabbi* tells us where these *Shops* were (c), *They were in the Mountain of the House*, by which the *Talmud* always meant the Outer-court or *Court of the Gentiles*: And another tells us what they were, when he says (d), *That the Shops were an open spacious Place, where Goods were sold, and Money exchanged*: And frequent Mention is made there of the (e) *Tables of the Money-Changers*; upon which *Maimonides* tells us, that (f) *he who changed the Money, was called Trapezita in the Mishna* (g). Mr. *W.* as much Mr. *W.* as he is, will scarcely (I think) desire a fuller Proof of the Fact than This is.

(a) *Quadraginta annis ante Excidium Domus migravit Synedrium majus, seditque in Taberna: (sec. aliam lect. in Tabernis Montis Sanyti) Avoda Sacra.* Edit. Edzard. p. 61.

(b) *Migravit Senatus ab exedra lapidum casorum (loco, ubi olim habebatur Senatus, ab Tabernis, & a Tabernis ad Jerusalem.* See *L'Empereur* upon the *Code de Middoth*. p. 43, 49.

(c) *Ita enim R. Nathan, Locus erat extra exedram lapidis nasi in monte adis, cui nomen Taberna.* Ib.

(d) *Nos autem solemus (dicit Elias) vocare locum apertum ad libera spatia, ubi vendunt merces, Tabernam; sic domus ubi mutant pecuniam cum fenore, dicitur Taberna.* Ib.

(e) *Vicesimo quinto die ad mensas sedebant in Templo.* Ib.

(f) *Mensa. i. e. ad mensam, quæ est ante Nummularium sive Trapezitam, qui super ea accipit pecuniam) & sic vocant eum, qui permutat pecuniam, Trapezitam in Mishna.* Ib.

(g) *Mishna.* Edit. *Surenhusii.* Tom. 4. p. 338.

But he seems aware that the Fact would be proved against him, and therefore brings in St. *Austin* as denying that This was a Profanation of the Temple: That Father's Words are, *Non ergo magnum peccatum, si hoc vendebat in Templo, quod emebatur, ut offerretur in Templo*; and then he goes on, *Et tamen inde ejecit illos: Quid si ibi Ebriosos inveniret?* &c. Now can any one think, that St. *Austin* meant to contradict *Christ*, and say that there was properly no great Sin in their doing that, by which *Jesus* said they had made the Temple a Den of Thieves? If he had, it would have been one of the Things which he should have put into his *Confessions*. But he meant only, that the Sin was not so great an one as some others are, that it would be worse to be found there a Drunkard than a Seller of Goods: And what he seems thus to excuse, is only the buying and selling in the Temple Things for the Service of the Temple, not (what our Saviour charges them with) the carrying on an unjust and unrighteous Trade there; so that his Apology for them as Merchants, does not vindicate them as Thieves.

By the Temple here is meant the Outer-Court of it, or the Court of the Gentiles; which (a) *Josephus* (in his Description of the Temple) calls the first Temple, as he calls the Inner-Court, where the Jews enter'd, the second Temple: And he tells us at the same Time that the Jews did not look on this Court of the Gentiles as a holy Place: No Wonder then, that they allow'd this Use to be made of it, which our Saviour found Fault with. But yet this Opinion of the Jews concerning this Court was an unworthy and mistaken one; for it was a Part of the Temple in general, it bore the very Name of the Temple, and (what is more) it was the only Place that the Profelytes of the Gate, who came up to the Temple, had to worship the God of Israel in: For this Purpose it was built very large

(a) De Bello Jud. L. 5. c. 5. p. 1226. Edit. Hudf. Τὸ δευτερον ἱερὺν. ἄγιον, ἐκαλήτο, καὶ τισσάρεκαδὲκα βιβλίαις ἐν ἀναστάθην ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου.

and spacious, that it might receive the great Numbers, which the *Jews* had Reason to expect to see there; because *Isaiab's* Prophecy (ch. lvi. 7.) runs thus, *Mine House shall be a House of Prayer for all People*: Which Prophecy our Saviour expressly (a) quoted against the Buyers when he drove them out, to shew them that their Practice was wholly inconsistent with the View and Intent of it, which was, that Profelytes from every Country under Heaven should come and worship there. It was a great Misapplication therefore of this Court of the Gentiles, to use it for *Tables of Money-Changers* and for *Seats of them that sold Doves*, and for *Droves of Sheep and Oxen*, which St. *John* iii. 15. tells us were brought in there, and for which no doubt there were Folds and Stalls to inclose them, and separate the Cattle of the several Proprietors; and if we consider what prodigious Numbers of all these there must have been in that Court (for *Josephus* (b) says that at one Passover *Cestius* computed three Millions who came there to celebrate it, exclusive of all those Profelytes who came there to worship only) it will be easily conceiv'd how much the Place allotted to the *Gentiles* for Worship, was crowded and the Room less'n'd; which surely was a great Indecency: But it was a Profanation of it too, because in the midst of the Bleatings of the *Sheep*, and the Lowings of the *Oxen*, and the Hurry and Bustle necessarily occasion'd by the other sort of Merchandise, the *Gentile* Profelytes were sure to meet with no small Disturbance in their Devotions; and therefore this Practice of the *Jews* was a defeating (as far as they could) the Accomplishment of *Isaiab's* Prophecy.

But the Case was still worse; for it seems probable that the Captains of the Temple, who were Officers

(a) St. Mat. xxi. 13. has, *My House shall be called the House of Prayer*. St. Luke xix. 46. *My House is the House of Prayer*. But St. Mark's Works Ch. xi. 17. are the very same with the LXX Translation of *Isa.* lvi. 7. and may be better render'd thus, *My House shall be called (or shall be) a House of Prayer for all Nations*.

(b) De Bello Jud. L. 6. c. 9. Edit. Hudson.

that had the Care and Charge of it, let out that part of the Court of the *Gentiles* for Profit and Advantage; and that the Sellers to make themselves amends for what they paid for their Shops and Stalls, made an Unjust and Exorbitant Gain. This however we are Sure of, that there was an Unrighteous Traffick carry'd on there, for our Saviour (as three of the Evangelists, who relate the Fact, assure us) does not charge them with having made the Temple a Place of Merchants only, but a *Den of Thieves*. In the former case if there was only an Indecency, yet in This at least it must be allowed that there was a Profanation of the *Temple* or *Court of the Gentiles*.

2. §. I proceed then to the 2d Objection, which was, How *Jesus* (if there was a Profanation) could have executed this Work of driving them out of the Temple. *It is hard to conceive* (says Mr. W. p. 22.) *how any one in the Form of a Man and of a Despis'd one too, (and we don't read that Jesus chang'd his Shape) with a Whip in his Hand, could execute such a Work upon a great Multitude of People, who were none of them his Disciples, nor had any Regard for him.* And he quotes a *Modern Author* as thinking This the most stupendous Miracle that *Jesus* wrought. He that thought so, we know, was St. *Jerome*, just as much a *Modern Author* as Mr. W. is one of the Primitive ones, or speaks their Sentiments: But I don't care if I make him a Present of this Miracle, it may do his Heart good to have the Number of them lessen'd; and if he can but get one Miracle given up, he will perhaps forgive me, when I shew that what he reckons the Greatest of all, might have been None at all.

I will let him see then how *Jesus* was plainly able to do, what he is said to have done, in a Natural way, and without the Help of any Divine Power.

And here it must be remembred, that *Jesus* was just come up from *Bethany* to *Jerusalem* in a Solemn Procession, in a sort of Royal and Triumphant manner:

He

He was attended on the Road and into the City with a very great Multitude (Matt. xxi. 8.) nay with Multitudes that went before and follow'd, ver. 9. and These went along with him into the Temple (as may be (a) gather'd from ver. 15.) and There proclaim'd as they had done on the Road, *Hosanna to the Son of David*, which was one of the Names of the *Messiah*. The Concourse was so great that *all the City was moved*, ver. 10. and even the Chief Priests were afraid of him and of the People too, because they took him for a Prophet and were very attentive to hear him, Mat. xxi. 46. Mark xi. 18. Luke xix. 48. and xx. 19. So that in what he did to the Buyers and Sellers in the Temple, he is not to be consider'd as one single Man only, but as at the Head of an infinite Number of People, all acknowledging him at that Time for their *Messiah* and King, and therefore ready to support him in any Reformation that he should attempt. The Traders

(a) The Words are, *When the Chief Priests and Scribes saw the wonderful works that he did, and the παῖδες Children crying in the Temple, and saying Hosanna to the Son of David, they were sore displeased*. Where by παῖδες is not meant Children, as we render it, but Jesus's Servants and Followers, those of his Train and Retinue. Thus Matt. xiv. 2. *Herod said to his Servants παῖσιν, &c.* and Luke xii. 46. *If that Servant say in his Heart, My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to beat the men-servants τῶν παῖδων*: and so Luke xv. 26. from which Instances I gather that παῖδες here signifies those who were the Disciples, Servants, or Followers of Jesus at that time: And what the Pharisees said in the following verse, *Hearst thou what these say?* seems to be the same with what they say on this occasion in Luke xix. 39. *Master, rebuke thy Disciples*. If the two Evangelists speak of two different times, yet the Pharisees seem to have desir'd him to rebuke the same Persons in both the Evangelists. It is scarcely to be suppos'd that only Children cry'd out *Hosanna* in the Temple, or that the Pharisees were so displeas'd with what Children only were saying. Besides, the word παῖδες does never in the New Testament signify Children, unless once or twice at most, and then the Age of them is specify'd, the proper word is *παιδια* or *παιδία*. What led our Translators to give the word this sense here, is (I conceive) the Answer that our Saviour makes, *Out of the mouth of Babes and Sucklings thou hast perfected praise*; but the meaning of this is, God has chosen for the praising of him Babes and Sucklings in Knowledge, not with respect to their Years; for Sucklings, that cannot speak, cannot perfect praise.

then

then might well have retir'd for *fear* of him whom the Chief Priests themselves *feared*, as having such Multitudes in his Retinue and at his Command: They did but what was Natural; they gave Way to a Superior Force, which it would been in vain to have resisted.

It is easy now to *conceive*, how *Jesus* could do this: He was not then *in the Form of a despis'd man*, but rather of a Triumphant Monarch; he was attended with a much *greater Multitude* of People than there was to oppose him, a *Multitude* of People who were all his *Disciples* and Followers at that Time, and who had the greatest *Regard* for him that Men could possibly have, they looking on him as their *Messiah*.

I would not be understood, by what I have said above, to mean that there was no Miracle in this whole Affair; for tho' I allow none, where Mr. *W.* and his *Modern Author* place it, yet there Seems to have been one (tho' the Evangelists don't call it so) in the Unanimous Disposition of the People at That time to proclaim *Jesus* by the Title of the *Son of David* or *Messiah*.

The Fame of his having raised *Lazarus* from the Dead a little before went a great Way, 'tis true, (*John* xii. 18.) towards filling Men's minds with this Belief; but yet so Universal, so Sudden, and with all so Short-liv'd an Acknowledgment of Such a Point, looks more like the Effect of a Divine Impulse than of any Natural Causes.

3. §. The third Objection was this; If *Jesus* could do this, yet was it not a Needless work to be so Zealous against the Profanation of that Temple which was so soon to be Destroy'd? No, because it was *not* Then Destroy'd: For is not every Place, that is set apart for Divine Worship, to be kept Sacred and Fit for that Use, while it is Subsisting? In such a Case we are to consider what things are Now, not what they are Hereafter to be: For what would have been a Profanation of the Temple, if it had been always to last, was equally a Profanation of it, tho' it was

to be soon Destroy'd; the Action is the Same under both Events, and is not in the least Alter'd by the Fate of the Place where it is done. 'Tis Ridiculous to talk, or think otherwise. If any man had Profan'd the Parish Church of St. *Bottolph Bishopsgate* about four Years ago, and had been *Presented* for it by the Church-wardens of that Parish, would it have been thought a Reasonable Question to ask, Why those Church-wardens were so Zealous against the Profanation of that Church, which they were then getting an *Act of Parliament* to empower them to pull down and Destroy? While a Place stands appropriated to Divine Worship, it ought not to be Profan'd; This is the Answer which every Lawier and every man of Common Sense would give on this occasion. And therefore *the Court of the Gentiles* which was a *House of Prayer*, ought to have been kept Free and Undisturb'd for that purpose, as long as it continued to be a *House of Prayer*, that is, till it was Destroy'd.

I have not here forgot that Mr. *W.* pushes this Matter farther, and says that *Jesus himself came to Destroy the Temple*, and that he *permitted, nay commanded it to be filthily Polluted not long after.* p. 23. and this he mentions to make the Inconsistence (as he thinks it) the Greater: But He, I am sure, was never more Inconsistent with himself than in This particular. For where does he read any thing Like this? Which of the Evangelists told him that *Jesus either came to Destroy it, or commanded it to be polluted?* *Jesus* tells the *Jews* indeed in *Mark xiii. 14.* that they would see the *Abomination of Desolation*, but then he adds, that they would see it *standing where it ought not, i. e. in the Holy place.* Now this is only a Declaration of what would happen, and it is observable that this Declaration is so far from being in Favour of Polluting the Temple, that it is directly Against it. Besides, if he had *commanded* it to be done, when the Temple was Destroy'd, *i. e.* almost forty years after his Death, then, when he *commanded* it, he must have been Alive again and Risen

Risen from the Dead. Did This Author consider this when he oppos'd *Jesus's* Resurrection? What? Not Revive, and yet Act? I see that for the Sake of an Objection to One Miracle, he can for a while allow the Truth of another, and does (as Conjurers are thought to do) raise a Spirit only to work some Mischief by his Help, and then lay him Quiet again.

I have now answered all his Objections, and I hope to the Reader's Satisfaction. As for his Quotations from the Fathers, I have no Mind to lengthen this Discourse with any Enquiry into them: for tho' it is True that They affected to give a Spiritual and Mystical Sense to this and almost all our Saviour's Actions, yet it is true that not one of them ever Deny'd or Doubted of the Literal Story, except when He makes them speak; nay the very thing which he has brought to prove them Unbelievers of the Letter shews the Direct contrary; for to make any Action a Mystical one, you must necessarily allow it to be a Literal one too; it may as well be said that there are Properties without a Substance, as that there can be a Figure without the Letter, except in Parables. I shall therefore pass by all his Scraps of the Fathers, for every Single one of which an Hundred might be found in the same Author, that expressly contradict what he is labouring to prove. He knows it very well, and therefore has all along made use of the Unfair and Dishonest Arts of Misrepresenting, and Curtailing the passages of the Fathers; sometimes leaving out in a Sentence what speaks against him, and sometimes bringing Sentences together which have no Relation to one another. Some Instances I have given already, and shall here present the Reader with One more. At the bottom of p. 26. he quotes St. *Jerome* thus, *Juxta simplicem Intelligentiam—quod penitus absurdum*, &c. and explains them above by making That Father say *there are Absurdities in the Letter*. But let St. *Jerome's* words be fairly produced, and they will run thus,

thus, (a) *According to the Literal Sense the Doves were not in the Seats (Chairs) but in Coops; unless perhaps the Sellers of the Doves sat in Chairs, which is wholly absurd to say, for Chairs are Marks of Honour to distinguish Masters and Teachers.* This Father, as many Others did, quibbled (poorly enough) upon the word *Cathedra*, by which is meant in the Gospels the *Seats* of them that sold Doves, but which He apply'd to the *Chairs*, that the Teachers of the Christian Church then us'd, as We do our Pulpits: And the *Absurdity* which St. *Jerome* finds, is in the supposing that the Sellers of Doves sat in such *Cathedra*, as the Teachers of his days made use of. He does not say a word of any *Absurdity* in the Letter, or Literal Account of *Jesus's* Action; tho' by dropping the Greatest and most Material part of the Sentence Mr. *W.* has contriv'd to make the words *which is wholly absurd* to seem understood of the *Literal Sense*. If such Authors as This did not seek for Truth, if they sought only to establish Falsehood, yet methinks they should avoid a Fraud so easily detected, and should be *Honest*er than This comes to, out of very Knavery.

But before he leaves this Head, he attempts to play the Critick on the Sense of the words in which the Evangelists relate this Action of *Jesus*: And here he seems to improve in his happy Art of making the Authors he quotes *bear False witness*, for tho' he *Mistakes* as usual, he *Falsify*s rather more.

Instead of *them that sold and bought* (says he, p. 30.) it should be rendred *them that sold and preached*; for the word ἀγοράζω does more properly signify to preach than to buy. It is so far from signifying this more properly, that it does not either in the New Testament, or (I believe) in any other Author, signify so at all. The word is used above thirty times in the New Testament,

(a) *Juxta simplicem Intelligentiam Columbae non erant in Cathedralis, sed in Caveis: nisi forte Columbarum institores sedebant in Cathedralis, quod penitus absurdum est, quia in Cathedralis Magistrorum magis Dignitas indicatur.* Hieron. in Matt. xxi.

and let him shew where it can once be understood of preaching: When it is said *Luke xvii. 28.* of that wicked Generation, who would not hearken to *Noah the Preacher of Righteousness*, and upon whom therefore the Flood came, *They did eat, they drank, they sold, they* *ᾠνοῦσαν*: are we to suppose that they were preaching? or when the *Wise Virgins* said to the *Foolish ones*, *Matth. xxv. 9.* *Go ye to them that sell, and* *ᾠνοῦσιν αὐταῖς*, can we think their Advice to have been, that they should preach to themselves? --- Is this Criticism?

But then he has found a new Sense for *Κολυβισαί*, or *Money-Changers*; the Greek word (says he, p. 31.) imports those who have a Knack to barter away a little *Base and Brass Money with the Effigies of an Ox or Bull on it, in exchange for good Coin.* And for this Sense of the word he quotes *Suicerus's Thesaurus in voce Κολυβισαί*. 'Tis so common a Book, that Mr. W. might have expected to be found out in any False Quotation from thence: *Suicerus* quotes *Theophylact* to shew that the *Collybus* was a small piece of *Brass Money of little value, with the Effigies of an Ox, &c., on it*; (not of a Bull; that's an Insertion of Mr. W. for the sake of a Jest); and he gives us this for his own Opinion, that (a) the *Κολυβισαί* or *Money-Changers* were such as sold, or gave, by way of Exchange, small pieces of Brass for other Money, I suppose, for Gold and Silver Pieces. But is this the same with giving *Base* (or *Bad*) Money for *Good*? Are not Twelve Pence in Copper as *Good Money* as a Shilling in Silver? Does the Baseness of the Metal, or Smallness of the Piece alter the Matter, when it is made up in Quantity? I am sure that This Author is a thorough *Collybist* in his own Sense of the Word, and puts off very *Base* Quotations for *Good* ones.

Once more, and I have done with Mr. W. on this Head: To make all this the more applicable to the *Hireling Clergy* of this Age, for whose sake he has brought in his *Preaching* and his *Bulls*, he says, p. 31. If

(a) Recte Κολυβισαί definiuntur οἱ τὰ λεπτὰ ἡμιστά παύταις, qui vendunt Minuta ara pro alia pecunia, scilicet accepto Collybo.

τρυφή, which is translated Tables, does properly signify Pulpits, who can help it? For this he refers us to Scapula's Quotation from Aristophanes. Scapula's words are these, (a) Aristophanes uses this word to signify a Pulpitum, or place rais'd higher than ordinary, on which the Slaves that were to be sold were expos'd to view. Mr. W. you see stop'd half way in the Quotation, that he might deceive the Reader into an Opinion that *Pulpitum* signifies there a *Pulpit*; but, when the whole Sentence is produced, it appears to signify something as different from it, as Dishonesty is from Good Policy.

II. The Second Miracle of *Jesus*, to which M. W. has made Objections, is that of his *permitting the Devils to enter into the Herd of Swine, which thereupon ran down a Precipice, and were all choak'd in the Sea*, p. 32.

And here I must remind the Reader, that in Facts done so Long since, and reported in so Brief a manner, it must often happen, that there can't possibly be any certain account given of Some Particulars; and Then, where a Probable one is offer'd, consistent with the Circumstances of the Story and with what other Historians relate, This is All that can be expected in the matter. In this Miracle before us, I promise that no Answer shall be given, which does not seem much more Reasonable than any Objection on the other side, even supposing it not to have been prov'd already that *Jesus rose from the Dead*; tho' I hope it will be remembered here, that if (as I shew'd Part I.) *Jesus* did really Rise again, it follows that he came from God, and that the Miracles which he is said to have wrought in his Life-time were Real ones; and This here being reckon'd by the Evangelists as One of the Number, with all Fair and Reasonable Men, their Inclination to Believe Every part of the Literal Account of it, should at least be Stronger than to Disbelieve Any.

(a) *Apud Aristophanem sic vocatur Pulpitum aut locus editor, in quo Verne & Manicipia omnium oculis venum exponebantur. Scapula in voce τρυφή.*

The Objections which Mr. *W.* has rais'd against the Literal Story of This Miracle are these Four.

How came those Madmen to have their Dwelling in the Tombs of a Burying-Ground? p. 32.

Where was the Humanity of the *Gadarenes* that did not take care of them, in Pity to Them as well as for the Safety of others? p. 32.

How came there to be any Herd of Swine in that Country; when the *Jews* were forbidden to eat Swine's Flesh? p. 33. Or

If the Swine belonged to Gentile *Gadarenes*, with whom it was Lawful to keep and eat them, where was the Goodness and Justice of *Jesus's* permitting the Devils to enter into a Herd of them to their Destruction? p. 34.

These are his four Objections against this Miracle, and I shall take them in their Order.

1. §. *How came those Madmen to have their Dwelling in the Tombs of a Burying-Ground?* The true Language of which Question is this, Can you give a Reason for the Actions of *Madmen*? They were *Madmen*, and Therefore they stroll'd thither. But this Objection looks a little like a Reasonable One, because Mr. *W.* had added the words of *a Burying Ground*; by which, if his Reader understands something resembling our Churchyards in Cities and Towns, and adjoining to the Church, he is Deceived; for as it is said that those *Madmen* were *among the Tombs*, so it is said that they were *in the Mountains*, and *in the Wilderness* or desert places. To understand which you must observe, that the *Jewish* Tombs were usually little Cells cut in the Sides of Caverns and the Hollow parts of Rocks and Mountains, at some distance from the Towns, and in lonely desert places. The *Sepulchre* that *Jesus* himself was laid in, was *hewn out of a Rock* in Mount *Calvary*; and many such Tombs remain even to this Day, as *Maundrel* and other Travellers thro' *Judea* have assur'd us. And these Caves often serv'd for a Retreat and Shelter, for in such as these the *Kings of Canaan* hid
hem.

themselves from *Joshua*, *David* from *Saul*, and *Josephus* the *Jewish* Historian from the *Romans* that pursued him: Nay he makes very frequent mention in his History, of whole Bands of Thieves and Robbers lurking for Months together in such hollow Rocks, and making Excursions from thence: And he tells us particularly that there were (a) *Dens* or Caves of this sort on that part of the Coast of the Lake *Gennesareth*, which was in the lower *Galilee*, and therefore lay contiguous to *Gadara*.

And these Mountains as they afforded Shelter, so they might have supplied the *Madmen* with Food; for in those Warm and Fruitful Climates They were not so Barren as we see them in Ours: *John the Baptist* (we read) liv'd in the Wilderness on *Locusts* and *Wild Honey*; and *Josephus* in his own Life tells us, that, when young, he went out into the Wilderness to be instructed by one *Banus*, (b) *who lived there upon what grew wild and without Culture*.

So that I have found *Victuals* and *Habitation* for the *Madmen*; and when it is prov'd that Others did, and They might have dwelt in the Mountains and among the Tombs, I hope the Assertion of three Evangelists that *Jesus* found them there, will overbear a mere Question unsupported with any attempt towards a Proof of the Contrary.

2. §. Mr. W's next Objection is, *Where was the Humanity of the Gadarenes that did not take Care of them, in pity to Them as well as for the Safety of Others?* Can any thing be more Perverse than this Question is? when *St. Mark* expressly tells us, chap. v. 4. that Care had been taken of them, that they had been bound in *Fetters and Chains*, and that this had been often done to them, but that they had pluck'd them asunder and broken them to pieces. The *Fetters and Chains* (whatever they were) were not strong enough for Men in their Out-

(a) Περί δὲ τούτοις τὰ περὶ Γεννησαὶρ λίμνην σπήλαια καὶ ἡ κατὰ καλεμένην Γαλιλαζαν ἀνιτυχίστατο. *Joseph. de Bell. Jud. L. 2. c. 20.*

(b) Τῶρον τὴν αὐτομάτας τρομὴν περσφρόμενον,

rageous

rageous Condition; and therefore they gat loose from their Keepers, and retreated to the *Tombs* and *Mountains*; where, when pursu'd, they probably hid themselves, and eluded all the Diligence and Humanity of the People who try'd to catch and bind them again.

But if This does not prove a Want of Humanity in the *Gadarenes*, he has another Proof, which he is sure is a Good one, *viz.* that they did *not dispatch them rather than their Neighbours and Passengers should be in danger from them*, p. 33. They are equally Inhumane in his Opinion (I find) for not taking Care to Preserve them, and for not taking Care to Destroy them: But I should have thought this an Argument for their Having Humanity, not for their Wanting it: For while the *Madmen* were alive, there were Hopes of laying hold on them once more, and perhaps of recovering them to their Senses. If Mr. *W.* had met with this Passage in some People's Writings, he would have rais'd a heavy Outcry against the Barbarity of the Doctrine of knocking a Madman on the head, only for fear he should do Mischief: And I would advise him, not to encourage this piece of Casuistry among Us. But after all, if the *Gadarenes* could not catch these *Madmen* to Bind them, how does he know that they could come up near enough to *dispatch* them? They might (in his notion of Humanity) have a very Good Will to it, and yet not be able to do the Good Deed; for *Josephus* will tell him what Difficulty *Herod*, with an Army, found to destroy a Sett of Robbers that had lodged themselves in such Caves of the Mountains.

And, to say no more on this Head, if the *Gadarenes* wanted This or any other Instance of Humanity, what is that to the Story? let Them look to their Behaviour: The Truth of this Fact is not affected by it; unless it can be prov'd Impossible that in any Country a Madman should be found Unconfin'd, that is often attempting to do Mischief.

3. §. I proceed then to the third Objection, *How came there to be any Herd of Swine in that Country, when the*

the Jews were forbidden to eat Swine's Flesh? Suppose we could not give any Account of this matter, yet is a Story, so well attested (as I have shew'd all *Jesus's* Miracles to be), is such a Story to be Disbeliev'd, when there is no Proof against it? I call it *no Proof*, because to say a thing was *forbidden*, and therefore it was *not* done, is to suppose that Laws are never broken, the contrary of which is seen every day, and was never more so than in *Mr. W's own Discourse*.

But I'll give him a very Fair and Probable account of this Circumstance. *Gadara* was a City on the other side of *Jordan*, near the *Lake of Gennesareth*; it was one of those Cities called *Decapolis*, and was situate in that Allotment which was made to the Tribe of *Manasseh*: *Pompey* indeed join'd it to the Province of *Syria*, *Augustus* afterwards gave it to *Herod*, and upon his Death annexed it again to *Syria*, as *Josephus* informs us: by this means it was inhabited partly by *Jews*, and partly by *Syrians* who were Heathens; *Josephus* (*a*) speaks frequently of both, as very Numerous there. But tho' its Inhabitants were thus of a mix'd sort, it was always reckon'd by the *Jews* as Part of their Dominions, and as such it felt the fury of *Vespasian* in the beginning of the *Jewish War* (*b*).

This being the State of the Town, and it being well known that the Heathens used *Swine* not only for Food but for Sacrifices too, why mayn't we suppose that the *Jews* of that Country might feed *Swine*, for the Profit they made by selling them to their Heathen Neighbours? (No, says *Mr. W.* from *Spencer de Leg. Hebr.*) *the Jews were forbidden, under the Pain of an Anathema, the keeping of any Swine in their Country*, p. 33. It is true, that there was such a (*c*) Law made in the time of *Hyrchanus*; but why was it made? because the *Jews* did use to keep *Swine*. And is it any argument to say, that because a Law is made against any

(*a*) DeBell. Jud. l. 4. c. 7. Ed. Hudf. & l. 3. c. 7. & l. 2. c. 18.

(*b*) Joseph. Antiq. l. 14. c. 5. & de Bello Jud. l. 1. c. 8. & l. 4. c. 7.

(*c*) Casaubon advers. Baron. Exercit. 13. Art. 31. n. 69.

thing, Therefore it was not practis'd after? It *ought* not, I grant, but it does not follow that it *was* not. Have We not Laws, many and strong, against running of Brandy, Tea, &c. and would you argue from thence that no Brandy or Tea is run upon our Coasts? if we could make this out clearly, we might save the Government the Expence of many Custom-house Officers.

If the *Jews* did once practise this feeding of Swine (as the Law made against it sufficiently shews), I don't see but it may be reasonably suppos'd that they might Continue to do so even After the Law was made: It is well known that there is too much of forbidden Trade among Us, tho' we have more Laws than One against it, and many Methods to put them in Execution: and it is much more likely that this feeding of Swine might be practis'd about *Gadara*, because it was not only upon the Extremity of the *Jewish* Dominions, but was then under (a) Heathenish Jurisdiction, so that the Force of the Law rested upon the Consciences only of the *Jewish Gadarenes*.

I have suppos'd with Mr. *W.* that the *Swine* belonged to *Jewish* Owners, which I have as much right to do as any one can have to suppose the contrary: and it seems Probable that even those *Madmen* were *Jews*; for we don't find *Jesus* in all his Travels conversing with and healing any but those to whom he was sent, *the lost sheep of the House of Israel*, unless in one case particularly taken notice of by the Evangelists. Upon this supposition, I have shewn it probable, that the *Gadarene* Jews might keep Swine for the Use of their Gentile Neighbours, tho' it was forbidden by Law, and even *under the Pain of an Anathema*.

4. §. I come to Mr. *W.*'s last Objection, *where was the Goodness and Justice of Jesus's permitting the Devils to enter into the Herd of Swine to their Destruction?*

(a) Joseph. de Bell. Jud. l. 1. c. 20, Ed. Hudson.

There was no want of *Goodness* or *Justice* in *Jesus*, even if they had belonged to *Gentiles*, who might eat them; for the part, which *Jesus* had in their Destruction, does not appear to be such as made him either Principal or Accessary: It is said indeed by St. *Mark* that he gave them leave, but by St. *Luke* only that he suffer'd the Devils to enter into them. By which may be meant no more, than that He did not Prevent them, that he did not Interpose his Divine Power, by which he might have hindred them from entering: for this Explanation may be justify'd by other Passages of the *Old* and *New Testament*, as (a) *Grotius* has fully shewn. And if this made *Jesus* a Sharer in their Destruction, it may as well be said, that God is answerable for all the Evil done in the World, nay he will come in for a share in This very Destruction of the Swine, for He too permitted it; and therefore by this Argument I don't see but his *Goodness* and *Justice* will be impeach'd upon this occasion.

But if the *Jews* of *Gadara* were the Owners of these Swine, as I have suppos'd, then there was no Injustice in *Jesus*, even allowing that he was Accessary to the Destruction of them, and gave the Devils such a Leave, as assisted them to do what they did: For then the Owners of them kept them against the Law made in *Hyrchanus's* time to prevent it: We find in *Josephus* an Edict of the Emperor *Augustus* requiring the Roman Governours, in every Country where the *Jews* resided, to suffer them (b) to live according to such of their own Country Laws, as were in force in *Hyrchanus's* time: from This one may gather, that all Laws made in *Hyrca-*

(a) Vide loca Gen. 29. 6. & 31. 7. Exod. 3. 19. & 12. 23. Psalm. 16. 10. Act. 2. 27. Ejicere Diabolum ex homine, Christi fuit Actio; in Porcos ut irent, nulla actione Christi erat opus: hoc enim optabant ipsi Diaboli, & viribus nativis id ipsum efficere poterant, dum ne vi majore impedirentur: Non erga Christus in hac re vim agentem exseruit, sed vim impedire valentem sustinuit. *Grotius* in Matt. 8. 31.

(b) Τὰς Ἰουδαίους χριστὸς δὲ τοῖς ἰσραήλ τοῖς διανοοῦν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἰσραήλ, καθὼς ἐχρῆστο ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεοῦ ὡς ἵσχυς. *Antiq. Jud.* l. 16. c. 6.

nus's Time were look'd on by the *Jews* as binding them; otherwise when they solicited that Emperor for this Edict in their favour, they would scarcely have fix'd on this Time for their Standard: so that by their own acknowledg'd Constitution the keeping of Swine was a Crime, and therefore the *Jewish* Keepers of them were justly Punishable for it. And it is well known that Prophets or Persons acting by the Spirit of God did frequently among the *Jews* put the Laws in Execution against Offenders, without calling in the Assistance of the Magistrate: nay, it was a received Maxim among the *Jews*, that such Persons had a Right to act thus, and to do much more than This, even to dispense with some of *Moses's* Laws, as might be easily shewn: What *Phineas* did to *Zimri*, and what *Elijah* did to the Priests of *Baal*, were look'd upon by the *Jews* as Precedents in this Case; and therefore We Christians, who acknowledge *Jesus* to have been more than a Prophet, can never be at a loss to account for his exercising an Authority among the *Jews*, which they allow'd every Ordinary Prophet to have.

I have now given an Answer to Mr. *W's* several Objections against this Miracle: and I hope that it appears to the Reader how Frivolous and Trifling they are. If we had had no Lights from History to help us out, yet a Christian might easily maintain his ground against meer Questions, which are not supported by any Proofs, and which might be effectually answer'd upon several Probable suppositions. But the Authors which I have quoted speak home to the Purpose, and both *Josephus* and the other *Jewish* Writers, whom I have made the most use of, can never be suspected of any Partiality in favour of the Cause I am maintaining; so that their Testimony, where it helps us, comes with the more Weight, and should put all Cavils under a perpetual silence.

Here, as in the former Case, Mr. *W.* would have us believe, that the Fathers look'd upon this Miracle as only a *Parabolical Narrative*: and he tells us, that upon
the

the Encouragement of Origen and others we ought to expose the Absurdities of the Letter. 'Till he can better shew the *Absurdities* of it, than he has done, all the *Encouragement* which *Origen* and the other Fathers give him, is to no purpose.

But where does *Origen* Encourage him to this? Why, he says, p. 35. that *Origen's Commentaries on this part of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospel are lost, otherwise unquestionably he would have told us that he did not believe any thing of the Letter of this Story.*

It would be strange indeed if Mr. *W.* should know what *Origen's* Opinion was in his Writings that are Lost, when he always mistakes it in his Writings that are Extant; But I can more *unquestionably* assure him, that, if those *Commentaries* had been preserved, *Origen* would have declar'd his belief of the Literal account of this Story, because he *has* done it in some of his *Commentaries* which are remaining; for in those upon *St. John's Gospel*, incidentally mentioning *the Country of the Gergelenes*, where *St. Matth.* lays the Scene of this Miracle (and which is thought to include *Gadara* in it) he says that (a) *Gergesa was an ancient City, near what is now called the Lake of Tiberias, in the Neighbourhood of which there is a Precipice adjoyning to the Lake, which is shew'd as the Steep place from whence the Swine were thrown down by the Devils that enter'd them.* Does not *Origen* here expressly declare his Belief of the Letter of the Story, when he points out the very Place, where he supposes it to have happen'd?

Let this then suffice for a Specimen of Mr. *W's* Acquaintance with the Fathers, or of his Sincerity in reporting their Opinions: I shall examine no more of his Quotations on this head, and indeed I might well dismiss the Subject, having given (I think) a suf-

(a) Γέργισα, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ Γέργισαί, πάλαι ἀρχαία περὶ τὴν οὖν καλεμένην Τιβερίάδα λίμνην, περὶ ἣν κρημίδι παρκαίμενοι τῇ λίμνῃ, ἀφ' ἧς δέκνυται τὰς χοίρας ἐκ τῶν δαιμόνων καταβιβλῆσθαι.
Vol. 2. p. 131. Edit. Huet.

ficient Reply to all the Exceptions he has made to this Miracle.

But it may not be amiss (before I conclude) to add some farther Remarks upon this Story, because there are Some (whose Opinion is of more Weight than Mr. W.'s) who seem to think the Circumstance of Men's being *possessed by Devils* or *Unclean Spirits* in our Saviour's days to be a great Difficulty, and therefore they suspect that nothing more than Madness is meant by such a Possession; and for this Notion of theirs they quote what the *Jews* said of *Jesus*, John x. 20. *He hath a Devil, and is Mad*, supposing that a Madman was in the *Jewish* way of speaking, called *one possess'd with a Devil* or *Unclean Spirit*. But the Truth is, that the *Jews* reckon'd this One sort of Madness, and the Worst sort; but they distinguish'd between This and what we properly call Madness arising from some Distemper of the Body: So that tho' they called all Persons possess'd with the Devil by the name of Madmen, yet they did not give to all Madmen the name of Persons thus possess'd: And they distinguish'd very rightly in the Case; for in the Instance of this Miracle before us, we find that the Devils Spake out of the possess'd Persons, they were Sent out of them, and they Enter'd into the Herd of Swine: Personal Actions as well as Speeches are ascrib'd to them, which can never be ascrib'd to meer Phrensy and Madness; for had there been nothing more than Madness, then when it ceas'd in the Men, it would have had no Influence on the *Swine*; whereas that which went out of the One and enter'd into the Other, must have had a Distinct Being and Existence of its Own. This therefore is the true Gospel Notion of *Demoniacks*, they were not *Madmen* only, but they were possess'd by *Unclean Spirits*; and if *Jesus* be prov'd to have come from God, he could not have been unacquainted with the Immaterial World, and therefore no one can reasonably refuse to believe the Account, which he has given us, of the Operations of Evil *Spirits* upon 'Human

man Bodies. Had no Authors, but the Sacred ones, made mention of the *Demoniacs* of those days, yet the Scripture Testimony would have been sufficient: But there are Unquestionable Authors which agree in this Story, and speak of Possess'd Persons as no uncommon Sight in their Days: *Josephus* (a) says that *Solomon* had from God the Art of casting Devils out of Men and healing them; and that he compos'd Charms for asswaging the Disease, and left behind him Forms of Adjuration, by which the Devils were so effectually cast out as never to return again; and he adds, that this way of healing was practis'd among his Countrymen even down to his own days. Whether the Jews had so effectual a method of dispossessing Men as *Josephus* thought, yet thus much appears plainly from his Testimony, that there were Persons possess'd with Devils in his days; and long before; nay he tells us in the same place that he saw one dispossess'd in the presence of the Emperor *Vespasian* and his Family: and to prevent our mistaking this Calamity for Madness, or any other Common and Natural Distemper, he explains what he means by being possess'd with Devils, when he (b) says that what were call'd so, were the Spirits of Wicked Men, which enter'd into living Persons, and occasion'd the Death of such of them as met with no Help. *Plutarch* and *Lucian* mention *Demoniacs* as well known in their days, and *Philostratus* in his Life of *Apollonius* among the Miraculous Cures which he ascribes to him, has a particular account of a Young Man who had an Unclean Spirit, (c) which

(a) *Antiq. Jud. L. 8: c. 2.* Παρέχει αὐτοῖς μαθεῖν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ τὴν κατὰ τῶν Δαιμόνων τέχνην εἰς ἀφελὴν καὶ θεραπείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἐπὶ δ' αὖτε συντάξας αὐτοῖς παραγορεύει τὰ νοσήματα, καὶ τὸ πῶς ἐξορκίσαν καταλείπει, οἷς ἐσδύμενα τὰ δαιμόνια ὥς μηκέτ' ἐταρταλθεῖν ἐκδιώκονσι καὶ αὐτὰ μέχρι νῦν παρ' ἡμῖν θεραπεία αὐτίστον ἱστέον.

(b) Ταῦτα καλεῖται Δαιμόνια (ταῦτα δὲ ποσὴν εἰς ἀνθρώπων νοσήματα) τοῖς ὕμνῳ ἐσδύμενα καὶ κλείοντε τὰς βοηθείας μὴ τυγχάνουσι. *De Bell. Jud. L. 7. c. 6.*

(c) Οὐ συγχωρεῖ αὐτὸν δικαιοσύνη — οἷς τὰ ἔρμα τῶν χυδαίων ἐκρίπτεται — ἀπελθεῖ κρημνὸς καὶ βάρβαρος.

made him wander from home, and led him into the Desolate parts of the Country, amidst deep Vallies and Precipices. Where the Reader may observe that the same Circumstances are said to have attended this Young man, as the *Madmen* in the Gospels: And whatever was the Truth of the Fact reported by *Philostatus*, yet it shews both his Opinion that there were *Demoniacks* at that time, and that the Effects of such Possession were commonly the same as the Evangelists represent them. I don't pretend to be able to assign the Reason why God permitted such Instances to be so Frequent in those Ages; but our Ignorance of the Reason is no Argument against the Fact, which we see is confirm'd, not by Christian Writers only, but by the Unsuspected Testimonies of Jewish and Heathenish Authors: Except we knew all the Ends and Designs of Providence, we can never set up for Judges whether the Means it makes use of are Wise or not: how often do we find our selves mistaking the Wisdom of even our Neighbour's Actions, for want of knowing what he has in view, and what the Circumstances of his Affairs consider'd all together require? And shall We object against things, which we read in the Sacred Writings, as Absurd and Unreasonable, when we Certainly are less able to fathom the Vast and Comprehensive Designs of Providence, than we are to pry into our Neighbour's Little, Narrow ones? A thousand things may be True, which we can give no Account of, because we are but Men; if therefore any one should ask me, why the Devils, which *Jesus* sent out of these *Madmen*, desir'd leave to enter into Cattle to their Destruction, I should perhaps answer, that *Jesus*, who best knew the Nature of such Evil Spirits, has all along represented them to us as delighting in Mischiefe; and therefore it seems natural enough, that Beings of such a Disposition not expecting that *Jesus* would permit them to enter into Human Bodies for the very same reason that he was then forcing them out, should desire to mischieve Man as much as they could in
 what

what is always very dear to him, I mean his Property: And if it should be asked again, why they desir'd to enter into a Herd of Swine rather than into any other Herd, I might answer that possibly no other Herd was there, or they might reasonably have thought that *Jesus* was not so likely to interpose in This Case as in any other, because the Owners of the *Swine* were justly Punishable with their Destruction. These Answers I might perhaps give to such Enquirers; but I should think that these Answers (like their Questions) were more Curious than Necessary, and should not think my self bound to prove more than that they are Probable: for to all Reasonable Men it is sufficient to shew (as I have done already) that *Jesus* having wrought the greatest of Miracles in raising himself from the Dead, there can be no foundation for doubting of the Truth of this Miracle wrought on the *Madmen*, even tho' there were less of Light to be drawn from Reason and History for clearing up the several Circumstances of it.

To conclude; having examin'd carefully all the Objections which Mr. *W.* has rais'd against these two Actions of our Saviour, I may venture to say that the Reader must by this time be satisfy'd of the Weakness and Unfairness of that Author's attempts. Perhaps I may shew more of them in another Discourse of this nature: In the mean while I hope that it will ever be remembred against such Unbelievers, that Things may seem Difficult to them, only because they are Ignorant; and that there is a Wide Difference between a Passage's not being to be Understood, and Their not Understanding it.

F I N I S